

Verwoerd Assassinated

The assassination on September 6th of Hendrik Verwoerd, late Prime Minister of South Africa, by a "colored" parliamentary messenger, briefly focused world attention on that country's system of apartheid. The San Francisco Chronicle editorialized: "Apartheid Sires an Assassin." If this theory of the underlying cause for the attack fails to jibe with that advanced at first by South African newspapers—that the slayer resented the Government's excessive generosity to Africans, and more recently with the plea of the defense that the killing was due to the malignant presence of an imaginary tapeworm in Tsafendas, it must be remembered that, in a police state, it is often difficult to arrive at an approximation of the truth. What really lay behind the stabbing will probably never be known. The assassin, recently judged insane, was committed to jail—not to a mental institution—for an indefinite period.

NEW LEADER

Apartheid has lost its father figure in the death of Verwoerd, but the system will continue, very likely tightened and intensified, under the new Prime Minister, Balthazar J. Vorster, formerly Minister of Justice, Prisons and Police, known as the architect and administrator of South Africa's harshest "security" laws.

Vorster was responsible for the world-condemned 90 Day Law, to which succeeded the 180 Day Act, permitting arrest on the flimsiest pretexts and imprisonment for up to 6 months—without charge or trial. To October 1966, 126 people have been detained under the latter act. It was during Vorster's five years as Minister of Justice that the prison population is said to have climbed from around 200 political prisoners in 1961 to more than 8,500 in 1966—by far the majority being Africans.

A NAZI LEADERSHIP?

Vorster's youthful Nazi sympathies help to explain his present totalitarian posture. During World War II, as a "general" in the outlawed pro-Nazi organization *Ossewa Brandwag*, he was arrested and interned for 15 months for attempting to sabotage South Africa's participation in the Allied war effort.

In fact, the growth of a Nazi-like authoritarianism in South African Government has been repeatedly remarked on—as for example by the Rev. Beyers Naude, a Dutch Reformed clergyman who lost his pulpit for this and other plain speaking, and by the *Rand Daily Mail*, which, referring to Rev. Naude's call to "our churches to resist authoritarianism and unchristian elements in race policy as *the German churches resisted the Nazis*", editorialized: "It is better to see Nazism coming and to forestall it rather than to wait until it is too late." (7/23/65)

The presence as settlers in South Africa of some 2,000 former Wehrmacht and S.S. officers who fled Germany after World War II tends also, in the minds of many, to bolster up the totalitarian orientation of the present Government. A journalist, Mr. W. G. Price, succinctly expressed this view at the British Trade Union Congress in 1965 when he stated that he regarded South Africa as

perhaps the most evil and wicked international influence since Hitler sent his troops marching across Europe. (*Star*, 9/10/65)

AND NOW?

For South African "resisters"—black and white—it certainly appears that Chief A. J. Lutuli, Nobel-Prize winner, was right, when he said in 1961 to questioning friends in Oslo: "Things will have to get a lot worse before they get better."

World Court Evades South West Issue

After almost six years of voluminous briefs, interminable arguments and countless questions by the 14 judges—all based on the merits of the case—a decision was announced by the International Court of Justice on July 18 in the suit of Ethiopia and Liberia against South Africa, which had charged violation of her 1920 League of Nations' Mandate over South West Africa. The ruling was surprisingly based on a point which had not been argued by either side or raised by the judges since 1962: the legal competence of Ethiopia and Liberia to bring the suit at all.

In 1962 this question had been considered settled by the Court's own judgement when it ruled that "it had jurisdiction to adjudicate the merits of the case." The final decision of July '66 therefore set aside the Court's own decision of four years earlier. Small wonder that Ernest A. Gross, brilliant and dedicated advocate for the plaintiff states, called the final ruling "an abortion of the legal process."

To reach this strange conclusion, the judge from Pakistan had to be disqualified—on the flimsiest of pretexts—and, to break the resulting deadlock, the Judge President had to vote a second time.

AND NOW WHAT?

South Africa's responsibility to promote the welfare of the people of South West and to report regularly and accept the supervisory authority of the United Nations, as set forth in three earlier advisory opinions of the World Court, has not been at all affected, however, by the recent ruling, so irrelevant to the grave issues at stake. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, speaking recently for the United States in the October debate on South West Africa, expressed the basic conclusions of nearly every U.N. delegation on these points:

1. A mandate exists, despite South Africa's denials; South West Africa has international status.
2. South Africa has violated this mandate and its obligations by the application of apartheid to South West Africa, and by refusing to report to the U.N.
3. South Africa has forfeited the right to continue administration of the territory.
4. The U.N. must now "discharge its responsibilities" with respect to South West Africa.

U.N. Passes Action Resolution

On October 28, after debating an Afro-Asian resolution on South West Africa for several weeks, the United Nations General Assembly adopted an amended resolution of historical importance by a vote of 114 to 2 (South Africa and Portugal against) with 3 abstentions. This was not just "another resolution" against South Africa. It was an *action* resolution. It terminated South Africa's right to administer the Mandate over South West Africa; it affirmed the right to independence of the people, and, most important, it called for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee, to be composed of 14 U.N. members and charged with the responsibility of implementing the resolution.

The practical problem, of course, is *how* the U.N. can take up its responsibility for the South West African Mandate. South Africa has made quite clear that it has no intention of leaving the territory, and indeed will "resist with all means in its power", to quote the Foreign Minister, Dr. Muller. How will the confrontation take place between South Africa and the U.N. authority? The Ad Hoc Committee is to make its report in no more than six months—by April 1967.

The debate on South West Africa was unusual. The item was debated in the plenary session as a matter of priority. The original resolution, backed by 54 African and Asian countries, would have resulted in a much earlier confrontation between the U.N. and South Africa than the present resolution, just passed, will permit. The Afro-Asian resolution called for the establishment of an Administrative Authority for South West Africa (not an Ad Hoc Committee to make recommendations), and asked this Authority to go "immediately" to South West Africa. The dilemma facing the African countries was that they knew they could probably get a two-thirds majority for their original resolution, but without support of the U.S. and some other Western countries. Without concurrence of the "Western Powers" the resolution would almost certainly not be implemented.

STIFF TESTS AHEAD

The drama of the debate on South West Africa at the U.N. was not in the speeches made in the General Assembly. It was the behind-the-scenes work in getting as strong a resolution as possible, still retaining U.S. support. Now that a resolution has been passed, the real work begins. The African states will be recommending a confrontation with South Africa, proposing to take over South West Africa with force—economic and military if necessary. The U.S. will want to postpone any such confrontation; Britain and France (who abstained on the resolution) may very well actively oppose it. Thus a fundamental test for the U.N. lies ahead. The U.N. could founder if it is found impotent to implement its decision to deprive South Africa of its mandate over S.W.A. This will be a real test for U.S. policy too, for the U.N. may well have to depend upon U.S. power, in taking over the administration of South West Africa.

If rapid progress is made for U.N. administration of South West Africa, this will be the first international step in limiting the spread of apartheid. If the effort fails, on the other hand, opponents of apartheid will have suffered a tremendous defeat, the life of the U.N. will be threatened, and the United States may have lost a final opportunity to convince Afro-Asian states of its good faith and its opposition to racism on the international as well as domestic level.

South West Africa

by Richard Thomas, Institute for Policy Studies

South West Africa is a country; there are people there. This is important to remember, during all the legal discussion and the wrangling and lobbying in the United Nations over the rights of administration. For nearly a decade petitioners from the territory have walked the corridors of the U.N. Their reception has been the more poignant, because to be a petitioner one must need be a refugee. And for every petitioner here, there are thousands at home: in the mines of Tsumeb and Oranjemund, in the fish factories of Walvis Bay and Luderitz, in white kitchens and white elevators of Windhoek. There are thousands more in the reserves, confined by poverty: poverty perpetuated by South African law.

The vital necessity for the rural Africans, whose land this ultimately must be, is to find in their country water for tomorrow and food for today. In the towns, the challenge is to exist in the midst of white conspicuous consumption, for the towns are "European" and the best schools are European and the skilled jobs are for "white only." So the blacks accommodate, with their "foolish" good nature. They accept—for now—the second-class citizenship with its daily slights. Some, turning their backs on the gigantic edifice of *apartheid* law and its omnipresent enforcers and informants, struggle through the terrible Kalahari Desert to Zambia and Tanzania, to refuge and perhaps college in a friendly country, or often to the U.N. On the other hand, others, remaining home, may ignore the law and proclaim their rights as men to organize and express themselves politically. This is a course that leads quickly to a South African jail.

Such is the black-white drama that plays itself out in South West Africa. But this is miniscule and almost irrelevant beside the international game which really counts. The enormous contest, with all of South Africa and its people as a single pawn, is a power strategy in terms of the devaluation of sterling, the British balance of payments, and world demand for the raw materials of Southern Africa. Moreover, the present detente with Russia has led to a marked and unfortunate apathy on the part of most Western nations as regards the fate of Africans in the still white-dominated territories.

The present position of the gigantic chess game is a result of the blind business eye of Western Governments. The U.S. is stuck in Southern Africa, not with a fifth column of democracy as some seem to imagine, but with a group of supra-national corporations, originating in the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. and exploiting the black cheap-labor market with callous indifference. The U.S. Government's lack of concern springs from their reluctance to set a precedent by moving against private enterprise even when it is in the national and international interest to do so.

Such are the major international issues in the foreground as the West confronts South Africa. And each of these issues works to *South Africa's advantage* in her determination to retain the administration of South West Africa.

What kind of land is South West Africa? The territory is more than 300,000 square miles in area, slightly larger than Texas. The utterly barren and waterless Namib coastal desert runs the entire length of the country and extends 80 to 100 miles inward from the Atlantic. Inland, the plateau area varies from virtual desert in the south, along the Orange River boundary with South Africa, through large areas fit only for grazing karakul sheep and

Bank Campaign Widened

cattle, to a relatively fertile plain close to the Angolan border in the far north. There is a small part of Ovambo-land where grain as a rule can be grown successfully, and there are potentially valuable stands of timber. Most parts of the plateau receive rain in one season of the year only and are subject to frequent droughts. No permanent watercourse lies within South West Africa.

Despite the land's austerity, the Africans of South West Africa would have a markedly high per capita income—by sub-Saharan standards—if they had equal opportunity and independence. The reason for this comparative wealth would lie with the extensive mineral deposits and the rich off-shore fishing grounds at the edge of the Benguela current. De Beers Consolidated, the South African diamond monopoly, dredges the coastal dune and



Refugees from S. W. Africa at Tanzanian Government Camp.

alluvial deposits and produces from South West Africa 16% of the world's gem diamonds. In the north, the Tsumeb Corporation mines a high grade lead, zinc and copper complex. The majority stockholders in the company are the American Corporations, Newmont Mining and American Metal Climax, which pay taxes to the South African administration and receive an extremely high return on their investment. For the future, scarcely mapped deposits of iron in the Kaokoveld, vanadium in the Tsumeb area, tin north of Walvis Bay, columbite at Karbib, manganese at Gobabis, copper near Rehoboth, zinc by the Orange River, and off-short diamonds, all await "political stability", improved infrastructure, and the rising prices of a Europe and United States short of raw materials.

The population of South West Africa is about 525,000. Of these nearly 74,000 are whites, mostly South Africans of Afrikaaner or German origin. Another 24,000 are "Coloreds" (persons of mixed descent), including the 11,000-odd *Basters* (literally "Bastards") of the Rehoboth Gebiet south of Windhoek.

The remaining 430,000 are indigenous Africans, primarily Bushmen, Nama, Damara, Ovambo and Herero. The *Ovambo*, a Bantu people, are estimated to account for 45% of the total population of the Territory; they live on both sides of the Angolan border. Many come south to work in the mines and fish factories because of the recurring drought and overpopulation. They are prohibited, however, from settling in the southern two-thirds of the country, where land and skilled jobs and an adequate education is for "whites only." The *Herero*, numbering 36,000, live in reserves within the white area, forming also a majority in the Windhoek location.

The campaign for withdrawal of funds from First National City bank, originated last April by students of Union Theological Seminary as a protest against that bank's financial support of apartheid, was recently widened to include Chase Manhattan bank. Chase is the other "giant" in the consortium of ten U. S. banks which since 1959 have participated in a 40 million dollar revolving credit plan for South Africa.

A COMMITTEE OF CONSCIENCE AGAINST APARTHEID has been formed, initiated by the American Committee on Africa and the University Christian Movement, to mobilize New York City's support for the campaign, and to urge individuals and organizations to examine their consciences—and their banking arrangements—in the light of the significant support to racism in South Africa being given by these two large institutions.

Mr. A. Philip Randolph, veteran U. S. civil rights leader, is Chairman of the Committee of Conscience; the sponsors to date number 115 religious, labor, civil rights and student leaders, and outstanding individuals in many walks of life.

PLAN OF THE CAMPAIGN

The plan of the campaign, in brief, is as follows:

1. *Pledges* of withdrawal of accounts (on or before December 9th) are to be signed and sent to the Committee of Conscience (see form on back page).
2. *Letters* to the banks (your own branch) are to be written at once, announcing intention to withdraw accounts by December 9th. (A sample letter will be sent for your use, if desired, when your withdrawal pledge is received.)
3. *Demonstrations* and leafletting are to be held during November at branch banks throughout the Greater New York area. One such demonstration has already taken place, on November 2, at the Chase Manhattan bank, Madison and 45th St.
4. On December 9th a mass demonstration will be held in the Wall St. area, marching to both of the main branches of the two banks, and simultaneously there will occur the actual withdrawal of most of the accounts at branches all over the city. (Some have already been withdrawn.)

WHY PICK ON THE BANKS?

This question is sometimes raised: there are dozens of large American firms—like Chrysler, Ford, Goodyear, etc., which have heavily invested and are continuing to invest in South Africa. They have built plants there, and they employ thousands of workers at sub-standard wage levels. Other U.S. firms carry on a brisk and profitable import-export trade with South Africa, which amounts to 300 or 400 million dollars a year. Why direct our opening U.S. boycott against the two big banks?

Several factors entered into this decision.

1. Banking, and particularly credit banking and extension of loans, is the essential underpinning and support of any economy. In shoring up South Africa's sagging credit and foreign currency situation, as First National City did in 1961 after the Sharpeville-induced financial crisis, these banks have bolstered not only an economy resting on inhuman exploitation, but also the political system of apartheid which oppresses the same non-white people whom the economy exploits.

2. A direct and effective protest can easily be made against the banks, simply by withdrawal of accounts and notification to the bank of the reasoning back of this action. For an initial campaign this action against the banks is considerably easier to work out than an operation aimed at the many and varied kinds of U.S. corporations involved with apartheid.

3. The bank withdrawal campaign, we hope, can serve as a "pilot project" for similar efforts throughout the country—perhaps against the other 8 members of the banks consortium, or against one or more of the firms operating—at huge profits—in South Africa.



A DEMONSTRATION was held on November 2 in front of the Madison and 45th St. Branch of the Chase Manhattan bank, as part of the continuing campaign for withdrawal of accounts from this and the First National City Bank because of their direct financial support to the Government of South Africa. Thirty-five people paraded before the bank entrance, in spite of a drizzle, bearing placards saying: "Your \$\$ at Chase Support Apartheid," and "Chase Manhattan Invests Your \$\$ in Apartheid. Close Your Account!" Approximately 1 500 leaflets were passed out and some pledges to withdraw were received on the street.

TO JOIN THE COMMITTEE OF CONSCIENCE AGAINST APARTHEID IN THIS CAMPAIGN

Fill out, sign and return the blank below to:

THE COMMITTEE OF CONSCIENCE AGAINST APARTHEID

211 East 43 St., Room 705

New York, N.Y. 10017

- YES! I will withdraw, on or before Dec. 9th, my account from Chase Manhattan and/or First National City bank.
- YES! I do not have an account at the banks mentioned, but I will write a letter to each, protesting their support of apartheid.
- YES! I will use my influence with my union, club, church, etc. to persuade them to also consider withdrawal.
- YES! I am willing to
 - take part in demonstrations
 - do leafletting, once a week
 - come to the December 9th demonstrations
- YES! I enclose a contribution for the Committee of Conscience

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____ PHONE: _____

South Africa Bulletins can be ordered in bulk for your organization. The charge is \$4 per hundred; \$15 for 500. Send check payable to American Committee on Africa with your money order to: Mrs. M. L. Hooper, ACOA, room 705, 211 East 43 St., New York 10017.